UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

"Rugged Individualism"

By CLARENCE R. SKINNER

The A B C of the World Court

By S. O. LEVINSON

The Butcher Shop of the Holy Spirit

By RAY NEWTON

The Call to Youth Today

By JAMES H. WEST

VOLUME CIV NUMBER 16

Chicago, January 6, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

SYDNEY COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Jacksonville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthèeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 12, 1929, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

Editors:

John Haynes Holmes — Francis Neilson
Curtis W. Reese — Louis L. Mann

UNITY is a weekly paper, sixteen pages containing timely editorial comment, special articles, foreign correspondence by its own representatives in Europe and Asia, book reviews, and regular reports of news from the field of liberal thought and action.

UNITY was the first American paper to discover Gandhi, of India. When the great Mahatma was unknown even to newspapers, UNITY hailed him as "the greatest man in the world." Its files contain the most complete record of Gandhi and his work that exists in this country. His autobiography, "The Story of My Experiments with Truth" is just completed.

UNITY was the first American paper to espouse and advocate the Outlawry of War, that remarkable peace program that is challenging the attention of the world.

UNITY has for more than forty years championed the idea of universal religion which finds in freedom the secret of unity and brotherhood, and it is today the outstanding organ of world religion.

Sample copies on request.

$3.00 per year.

700 Oakwood Boulevard **CHICAGO**

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 243
"Rugged Individualism"—CLARENCE R. SKINNER 245
Jottings.—J. H. H. 246

ARTICLES—

The A B C of the World Court—S. O. LEVINSON 247
The Butcher Shop of the Holy Spirit—RAY NEWTON 250
Youth and the World—III—The Call to Youth Today—JAMES H. WEST 251

POETRY—

Jerusalem—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 243

THE STUDY TABLE—

What Is Religion?—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE .. 252
Modern Catholicism—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 253
Can We Help It?—EMANUEL STERNHEIM 253
Note on "Palestine Today and Tomorrow" ... 254

CORRESPONDENCE—

Cruelties in Hungary—ALICE STONE BLACKWELL 254
College Football—H. P. BOYNTON 254
A "Birth Control" Meeting—M. L. 254
An Explanation—T. RICHARD WITMER 255

THE FIELD—

The Divine Plan—*Alfred N. Chandler* 255
The Church and Labor 255
What Prohibition Prevents 255

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CIV | MONDAY, JANUARY 6, 1930 | NUMBER 16

JERUSALEM

I.

I know not if in any land of men
  There dwells a city lovelier than this;
I know not that mine eyes shall see again
  Such quietude of beauty and of peace.

II.

Afar, o'er Judah's hills, I see the light
  Darken in splendor to the evening's close;
On gentle winds the voices of the night
  Drift to my ears, and waft me to repose.

III.

I know why David, when the stars pour'd down
  As now they pour their lustre from the sky,
Rose from his bed to gaze upon the town,
  And lift his heart in silent ecstasy.

IV.

I know why Jesus, when he trod this hill
  And looked upon the city's lordly state,
Paused on his way in rapture, and was still,
  Then wept in sudden vision of her fate.

V.

What wonder that her sons could not forget,
  But yearn'd for her through all their scatter'd years?
I know their passion and its wild regret;
  I feel within my heart their flood of tears.

VI.

Not on this earth, in any land of men,
  Dwells there a city lovelier than this.
I know mine eyes shall never see again
  Such plenitude of beauty and of peace.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

On the Mount of Olives
On a night in February, 1929

Plans, or perhaps rather hopes, for the year ahead hold at least one great feature for UNITY'S readers. We refer to the publication of a series of weekly articles, if they may be called such, containing valuable material on literary, ethical and religious subjects from the unpublished manuscripts of LEO TOLSTOY. These manuscripts are now being edited and printed in Russia by the Soviet government, in recognition of the recent one hundredth anniversary of the birth of the immortal saint and seer. Among them is a sort of calendar, or commonplace book, in which Tolstoy set down each day his passing thoughts on questions of the day and on basic problems of man's life. These thoughts, arranged in pithy paragraphs, are of an intimate character, and therefore of the most profound interest. Interspersed are impressive quotations from famous writers, ancient and modern, which chanced to appeal to Tolstoy's mind. The material constitutes an amazing revelation of the soul of this Russian whom many of us reverence as the outstanding spiritual genius of modern times. We already have two chapters, or sections, of this material now in our hands, and are corresponding with the editor to the end of securing permission to publish the whole in UNITY during this coming year. The series would run for a period of twelve months, and would be a worthy successor to the recent great achievement of Gandhi's autobiography. We hope to be able soon to make definite announcements in this place. In addition, for this coming year (1930), we can definitely promise a series of "Parables of War and Peace" by our Editor-in-Chief, Mr. Holmes, and the usual editorial and contributed features which have given UNITY such interest and importance in recent years.

It is becoming increasingly evident that we are in for a hard winter so far as business conditions are concerned. The government is singing a brave song; industry is whistling shrilly as it walks through the graveyard of its hopes; newspapers and other organs of publicity are busy putting over their propaganda lies about prosperity. But nothing avails. Like a slow-moving lava stream, the wave of commercial depression is engulfing the land. The Christmas trade, for example, was utterly disappointing except in the shops and stores of cheaper grades. Now that the holidays are over, thousands of employees are being discharged, to add themselves, like rivers to the sea, to the already immense volume of unemployment which existed before the holidays began. The Detroit employment index in December was 25 per cent below the level of a year ago. This reflects, of course, the drastic deflation of automobile production, but the automobile is central to the nation's life, and disaster here must soon

spread everywhere. Thus, the employment index of the U. S. Department of Labor, based on reports from 12,000 factories employing over 3,000,000 workers, shows already for the whole country a drop of 3.1 per cent as compared with the preceding month. The standard of wages is being maintained, in obedience to President Hoover's demand, but what good does this do when to millions of workers wages are no longer being paid at all? Meanwhile, charitable societies and relief agencies were never before finding it so hard to collect funds. The attempt to conceal these facts is persistent. We have the same psychology about panics that we used to have about pestilence. Deny the facts—suppress all information—keep right on living as though nothing were the matter! But such policy is childish. It is worse than childish—it is dangerous. The first duty in any emergency is to know the truth. The truth in this emergency is that a winter of appalling distress is before us.

Straws show which way the wind is blowing! Speeches in Congress, proposed bills for legislation, discussion in press and pulpit, talk on the streets and in the trains, all indicate that the hour has struck for the federal investigation and regulation of stock exchanges. Time after time, in the years of development of this country, the government has had to step into some great field of private enterprise, and take over control in the name and in behalf of the public. Again and again, in other words, some business has become too powerful to be longer trusted to conduct its own affairs. If the people of the nation are to be protected from exploitation and even open robbery, and the government itself protected from the arrogant dictation of interests more potent than itself, the state must prove its primacy by assuming the regulation of this business. In any truly civilized community, of course, the state would not stop with regulation, but would move at one great stride to public ownership. But regulation is thus far in our history the accepted method of procedure and it goes far in the direction of the very ownership of which we speak. Thus, railroads have all but fallen into the hands of government —as witness the recent consolidation program of the Inter-State Commerce Commission. Pipe-lines have followed inevitably in the wake of railroads. Banks are under the control of the Federal Reserve System. The radio is firmly in the grip of Washington. And now the stock exchanges are next in order! The recent crash in Wall Street, in which billions of dollars were lost and millions of investors ruined, and the prosperity of the country thrown into sudden confusion and depression, shows conclusively that this enormous private enterprise must now come under the control of the public. "Prices of agricultural products dealt in upon the great markets," said President Hoover, in his late message to Congress, "have been affected in sympathy with the stock crash." Other things beside agricultural prices have been affected by this disaster. A whole nation has been brought near to wreckage. Which means that the people must turn to their government to protect them against an interest which gambles on the fruits of their labor and robs them of their hard-earned wealth! We call for an investigation of stock exchanges comparable in scope and authority to the famous Armstrong Investigation of insurance companies in New York, and upon the basis of such investigation a program of federal regulation.

Now that the marines are busy again in Haiti, it may be well to take note of recent remarks by Smedley D. Butler, Major-General in the Marine Corps, about United States rule in Latin American dependencies. This "hard-boiled" warrior served his time in Haiti, and while there was instrumental in helping the President, hand-picked in Washington, to dissolve the Haitian Congress and thus prevent it from enacting a new constitution. "I aided the President," said Butler, "in drawing up the edict that dissolved the Congress." In Nicaragua General Butler took charge of elections, and did whatever was necessary, apparently, to insure the success of candidates favorable and subservient to American occupation. "Our candidates always win," said Butler. And why shouldn't they? "When it is necessary to elect a candidate, the opposition contenders are declared bandits." But this is not all! Speaking of a certain election, General Butler gave this testimony:

> "The fellow we had in there nobody liked. But he was a useful fellow—to us—and so we had to keep him in. How to do it was the problem.
>
> "We looked up the election laws and found that the polls had to be open a 'sufficient length of time.' At least, that's the way we translated it. The law also provided that a voter had to register to be eligible to vote.
>
> "The district was then canvassed and 400 were found who would vote for 'the proper candidate.' Notice of the opening of the polls was given five minutes beforehand. The 400 voters were assembled in line. In about two hours, as soon as they had voted, the polls were closed. The other citizens had not registered and therefore were ineligible to vote."

Statements of this kind help explain what American occupation means, and why, as in Haiti, for example, there are uprisings of the people which have to be quelled by machine-gun fire. By the terms of the 1916 treaty with this little Republic of Haiti, the United States is in the island to assist in the formation of a responsible, orderly government. What events show is that we are there by force of arms, exercising a political overlordship which serves nobody's interest but our own. Or else we have so far failed to fulfil our professed purpose that, after thirteen years of occupation, we can maintain order only by shooting down unarmed persons in the streets and squares. In

either case, our rule is abominable. It should be ended forthwith.

The revival of public discussion of the independence of the Philippines is encouraging. Not for years has the cause of the Islanders been so loudly acclaimed. There exists something more than a full-sized suspicion that the new and sudden support of independence is not unselfish. The vigorous activity of the sugar-growers points definitely to the idea that much American sentiment is in favor of liberating the Filipinos not because they desire it or we promised it, but because the trade products of the archipelago could be profitably taxed here as imports from a foreign country. The whole thing, in other words, is only one more chapter in the endless story of the protective tariff. But even so, we are glad the issue is to the fore again. More than one great cause has been served before this by bad motives and selfish interests. If we could rely on nothing but high ideals to win our victories, we might well be doomed to wait forever. In this case the issue is plain. The Filipinos should be free. On the basis of general principles, this democracy of ours has no right to be engaged in the business of ruling foreign peoples against their will. More specifically, we are bound by a promise, signed and sealed, to grant these so-called "wards" their independence. Nothing can stand in the way of the fulfilment of this promise, and the return of our own nation to its ideals of liberty, but the selfish interests of those who find it profitable to hold the Filipinos in bondage. If, now, these interests can be met and overcome by the equally selfish interests of others who would find it profitable to release the Filipinos, why complain! Once again we have an instance of economic forces determining history. Since such forces are decisively at work anyway, why not let them achieve the good cause rather than the bad?

We wonder if any invention in the civilized world was ever quite so terribly disastrous as that of fire-arms. Invented undoubtedly, like primitive weapons, as a means of defense and security, they have distributed more death, destruction and general insecurity than any other one agency which could be mentioned. The horror of modern war is, of course, the crowning illustration. Think of how men have piled up arms always to defend themselves against their enemies, and think how these arms have sooner or later turned upon those who wielded them, and destroyed them utterly. The same thing is true in the matter of crime and criminals. Society arms itself to the teeth against bandits, highwaymen, murderers, only to have these outlaws arm themselves and thus precipitate an unending battle in which death stalks triumphantly on both sides of the field. Look at such a sensational episode as the attempted jail-break in Auburn Prison in New York some weeks ago! Ten long-term offenders, desperate men, get possession of guns, hold up the jail, capture the warden, kill one keeper, and mortally wound another keeper, before they themselves are put out of the way. Instantly terror sweeps every prison in the state, machine-guns are placed on walls and turrets, and guards pace feverishly night and day. What a spectacle! Where is the security in arms? How much better off are we for all our guns, armories, prisons, militia, and force generally? Some day somebody is going to get sensible in this country, as by some miracle somebody became sensible in England when the police were disarmed, and ban the manufacture, distribution and use of fire-arms altogether. Then somebody else will get more sensible, and strip governments of weapons as well as individuals. No man, no nation, can ever know real security, until universal and complete disarmament has been accomplished.

"Rugged Individualism"

Everyone who gave the slightest degree of attention to the issues of our latest political campaign will remember that Mr. Hoover constantly reiterated the appeal for "rugged individualism" as the method and ideal of American government. There are probably few if any Americans who are more thoroughly opposed to socialism and communism than our President, and few if any who better exemplify the individualistic tradition of the United States. Mr. Hoover not only believes in "the inner light" from the religious point of view, but is also its ardent disciple in economics and civics. He probably believes, with all individualists, that the ideal social order is the one in which each person is least under pressure of law and regulation, and conversely, most free to dedicate himself to voluntary pursuits and interests. The President was undoubtedly elected largely on that basis, and he consequently may be said to represent the hopes and ideals of the American people.

But Mr. Hoover's individualism is a curious phenomenon, not to say anachronism, from at least two points of view; and it is eminently worth while to examine the situation with a view to a better understanding of the present political and economic complex.

First, the fact that the candidate for President on the Republican ticket should be the advocate of individualism, shows our present political topsy-turviness, for the true and essential genius of Republicanism is its federalism, over against the localism of the Democratic party. But ever since the tragic end of the Wil-

son administration, we have had Republican presidents with Democratic ideals in the White House. Harding came into office on a wave of reaction against too much federalism under a Democratic regime. Undoubtedly the country wanted an opportunity to be left alone, and yearned to be free from war restraint. Coolidge followed with the same philosophy. He was astute enough to see that at the time when he assumed office, there was a persisting reaction against governmental regulation and interference. He kept the Ship of State pointed toward the philosophy of individualism, insofar as it was consistent with his view to keep the ship consciously pointed at any kind of philosophy at all.

Mr. Hoover fell heir to the tradition of this neo-Republicanism and promised to carry on to the best of his ability.

The anomaly, therefore, of "rugged individualism" enthroned in the White House during a Republican administration is obvious. It indicates that the Republican party has abandoned its policy of federalism, probably never to return thereto. This leaves the Democratic party without a real genius of opposition, making it increasingly a party of opportunism. The political consequences of such a dilemma are obvious: namely, the glaring need of a new party in the United States which shall stand primarily for social ascendancy over rugged individualism, a party which will stand consistently and persistently for principle rather than for opportunism.

The second phase of Mr. Hoover's philosophy which we may well examine is its evident inadequacy in the presence of great need arising from crisis. His actions prove that he is far wiser than his pronounced theory; something which is fortunately true of numberless men, and Mr. Hoover is clear sighted enough to recognize the fact.

In the first place, loving peace as the President does, he knows that every advance toward limitation of armament, better international understanding, and world organization cannot be brought about without a high degree of socialized action. He knows that men must be brought into line, that masses must be educated, and he goes about it with a determined will. There must be conferences, and legislation. In a word, while leadership such as his own is and always will be largely a matter of personal initiative and thus have within it some element of rugged individualism, nevertheless the action which follows his initiative simply must be highly social in the modern world to be effective.

In the second place his action in regard to the financial crisis brought about by the collapse of the Wall Street market is another example of the action being better than the theory. Did he satisfy himself with an appeal to individuals to have faith in the essential soundness of the economic set-up of the country? He did not. He proposed legislation and was successful in putting it through in a remarkably short time. He summoned men to conferences, and set into action almost immediately a series of remarkable socialized activities on the part of leaders of industry throughout the country which showed an essential soundness in Mr. Hoover's psychological and political set-up that proved him better than his philosophy.

But it might be objected that while "rugged individualism" will fail in critical situations, it will nevertheless work by and large for normal times and in the long run. Such a reply seems to the writer to indicate myopia, for the fact is that it is inevitable in our present type of economic order that there shall always be strain, crisis and pressure.

Our industry is so highly specialized that it cannot function to the highest efficiency without a socialized coordination operating continuously.

International relations are so closely intertwined that definite control must be exercised at all times to keep the dogs of war from slipping the leash.

Our communities are so completely socialized in regard to transit, sanitation, food supply, and other vital necessities that they would fall into instant starvation or plague were they not coordinated and legislated into planful action.

Rugged individualism, as Mr. Hoover himself sees it, is an inadequate philosophy for a world that has become an integrated, highly interdependent organization.

CLARENCE R. SKINNER.

Jottings

Churches, charity societies, philanthropic organizations are the first to suffer when hard times come along. In the light of this experience, we commend the following statement of Einstein, who seems to be as great a humanitarian as he is a scientist:

> It seems to me that in the days of coming depression many good folk begin to economize at the wrong end. They seek to escape their social obligations and duties instead of curtailing their personal expenses.

There was a time when the initials, "T. R.," were the magic symbol of popularity. But these seem now to be displaced by the initials, "R. V." Some years ago it was Rudolf Valentino. Now it is Rudy Valeé. Who comes next?

A proposed new censorship bill in Massachusetts provides that all censors shall be obliged to pass intel-

ligence tests. This surprises us. We had never imagined that censors had any intelligence to be tested.

It always gives us something of a jolt to read of aviators killed or injured as the result of colliding with a mountain. It takes time to get adjusted to this latest hazard of contemporary life.

A single inspection in the single borough of Queens in New York City revealed 15,000 violations of the building code. It is obvious that this building code should be repealed at once, and builders be given the personal liberty to erect buildings any way they want to without being made criminals by oppressive laws. So the "wets" would argue—that is, if they were logical, which they aren't!

Not being able to get Vare, Pennsylvania takes Grundy for senator. Well, for states who want that kind of senator, that's just the kind of senator they want.

J. H. H.

The A B C of the World Court

[The great change which has recently taken place in the status of the World Court is little understood in this country. This change is largely due to the enactment of the Briand-Kellogg Treaty, and was achieved at Geneva this last summer by the author of the Outlawry of War principle embodied in the Treaty, Mr. S. O. Levinson. In the following article, originally prepared for the Chicago *Daily News*, Mr. Levinson shows in illuminating detail just what has been done. It is upon the basis of this information that UNITY now favors American participation in what is for the first time an independent world tribunal of international justice sustained not by arms but by the public conscience of mankind.—Editor.]

The foundation of the court, its constitution so to speak, is article 14 of the league covenant. This provides "for the establishment of a permanent court of international justice. The court shall be competent to hear and determine any dispute of an international character which the parties thereto submit to it." Thus it is plain that in all litigated disputes, now commonly called contentious cases, the jurisdiction of the court depends upon the consent of the parties. No one questions this. In the same paragraph, referring to advisory opinions, article 14 provides: "The court may also give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or question referred to it by the council or by the assembly." It is to be noted that there is no reference in this provision to the question of consent. Those of us who originally opposed American adherence claimed that the council might ask for an advisory opinion, at least, in matters affecting member nations, without their consent, as contrasted with the requirement of consent in contentious cases.

More than two years before the 1926 court debate in our senate, the court itself, in a decision upon the request from the council for an advisory opinion concerning a dispute between Finland and Russia, known as the Eastern Carelia case, held that it would not render an advisory opinion unless both parties consented. In this case Russia, a non-member nation, had refused consent. The language of the court on this point is as follows:

"It is well established in international law that no state can, without its consent, be compelled to submit its dispute to other states, whether to mediation or to arbitration or to any other means of pacific settlement. . . . The court, being a court of justice, cannot even in giving advisory opinions, depart from the essential rules guiding their activities as a court."

The council of the league, however, was reluctant to accept this decision and went on record to the effect that it "could not exclude the possibility of resort by the council to any action, including a request for an advisory opinion from the court, in a matter in which a state non-member of the league and unwilling to give information is involved, if the circumstances should make such action necessary to enable the council to fulfill its function under the covenant of the league in the interests of peace."

Here then was the bone of contention in the senate in January, 1926. Senator Borah, the leading opponent of advisory opinions, contended all through the debate that as the Eastern Carelia decision was by a divided court—six to four—and as the council itself had refused to be committed to this important decision, a change of two in the personnel of the court might cause a reversal of the holding on this question of jurisdiction in advisory opinions. The same point was stressed by Senator LaFollette and others during the course of the debate in 1926. In this uncertain situation Senator Borah and others insisted that through the instrumentality of advisory opinions the council might exert political domination over the court. While improvement as to the practice in advisory opinions was made by certain rules of the court, the fear remained as to the final attitude of the council on this vexed question. Would any future court ever deliver an advisory opinion to the council touching any dispute without the consent of the disputant nations? If so, then there was basis for the charge of potential political manipulation of the court, the impairment of the court's judicial quality, and the ability by indirection to emasculate the Eastern Carelia decision.

This question was not settled by the famous Root-Hurst formula. That formula might satisfy the United States as to advisory opinions affecting us, but it left the question entirely open as to whether the council might not, from this or some successor court, procure advisory opinions affecting the other nations of the world, at least, those that are members of the court, without their prior consent.

It was my privilege to go to Europe this summer on my own initiative, without representing either the administration or any member of the senate. I desired to ascertain at first hand whether the nations members of the court and their jurists would not be willing to put an end to this controversy by accepting the spirit of the Eastern Carelia case and embodying it in the report of the jurists and in the statute of the court.

After numerous interviews, both at The Hague and at Geneva, with various premiers, foreign minis-

ters and the leading jurists, I found a splendid spirit of co-operation and a willingness to consider making such changes as would rid the court of the last vestige of political domination arising out of the procedure on advisory opinions. Indeed, it was Sir Cecil Hurst who, after two discussions, suggested that we settle this matter for all time by incorporating it in the court statute. I also ascertained the willingness on their part completely to disavow power in the league, or any other body, to enforce the decisions of the court by war in any form.

I presented, therefore, at Geneva, two propositions:

(a) That the statute of the court be amended so that the league could not call upon the court for an advisory opinion touching any phase of a dispute between nations without the free consent of those nations.

(b) That the power to enforce decisions, which in the senate debate in 1926 the league was charged with possessing, should be completely disavowed so as to make the world court a genuine world peace court.

Both of these things were done.

The reports were submitted to the assembly at Geneva by the jurists on Sept. 13, 1929, and were accepted and adopted by the assembly on the next day. The amended statute relating to advisory opinions—the new article 68—reads as follows:

"In the exercise of its advisory functions, the court shall further be guided by the provisions of the statute which apply in contentious cases to the extent to which it recognizes them to be applicable."

This puts the status of advisory opinions on the same footing as contentious cases, which, as we saw from article 14 of the covenant, can only be heard on the consent of the disputant nations. To revert to the exact language of the covenant: "The court shall be competent to hear and determine any dispute of an international character which the parties thereto submit to it." The effect of the present article 68, read in connection with article 14 of the covenant, is to give this unmistakable result:

"The court may also give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or question referred to it by the council or the assembly with the consent of the parties thereto."

Otherwise stated, it is the same as if the language in article 14 which requires consent in contentious cases were repeated at the bottom of the next sentence relating to advisory opinions.

This is the direct legal effect of the new amended article 68 of the court statute. Now, in addition, the jurists and the assembly have gone even beyond what I asked them to do. Under the report of the jurists adopted by the assembly on Sept. 14, 1929, the court will not render an advisory opinion touching any dispute between nations, even upon consent, unless both sides are fully heard and fully present their case. This is a most beneficent provision. It means that the court will not be interested in taking a default or in deciding a case on the presentation of only one side. The court has no sovereign power behind it because there is, and should be, no world sovereignty, and it desires to render all decisions only after presentation and argument of both sides, so that the decision may be useful in the development of international law. The jurists' reports adopted by the assembly on Sept. 14, 1929, make this abundantly clear. I now quote from official document No. A50-1929-V. At the top of page 3 this report quotes the new article 68 in full and then adds:

"The conference associated itself with the following observations formulated in the course of its discussion with reference to the new article 68:

" 'In contentious cases where a decision has to be given, the procedure naturally involves hearing both parties; the two parties set out their arguments and observations, and the judges are thus provided with all the material necessary for reaching a conclusion. It must be the same in the case of advisory opinions.

"When an advisory opinion is asked, it is really indispensable, if the opinion is to carry any weight, if it is to be truly useful, that in the same manner as in a contentious case all the material necessary for reaching a conclusion should be placed before the person consulted; he requires to know the arguments of both parties.

" 'This is the reason for providing that the procedure with regard to advisory opinions shall be the same as in contentious cases.' "

Here then is not only a direction to the court that the procedure in advisory opinions must be the same as in other cases, but the reasons therefor are given, so that he who runs may read, and the reasons do honor to the jurists.

I also quote from official document A49-1929-V, also a jurists' report, adopted by the assembly on Sept. 14, 1929, contemporaneously with the change in article 68:

"The procedure followed by the court in dealing with the questions submitted to it for an advisory opinion is in fact almost identical with the procedure which followed in dealing with contentious cases."

Here then we see in two official reports adopted by the assembly, constituting practically all the present members of the court, that the vexed question as to advisory opinions raised in opposition to the court in our senate in January, 1926, has been completely answered and cured. In addition thereto, the reports require that the court shall not give an advisory opinion, even with the consent of the disputants, unless both sides are fully heard. This is a protective measure in judicial procedure beyond anything that was suggested in the senate or thought of by myself.

The suggestion appearing in the isolationist press that there is a "joker" in article 68 of the statute is nullified by the reasons, instructions and interpretations contained in the reports. This suggestion implies that under the language of article 68—the court "shall further be guided by the provisions of the statute which apply in contentious cases to the extent to which it recognizes them to be applicable"—the court by arbitrary discretionary power can refuse to give effect to the provisions requiring consent; in other words, that the court can emasculate article 68 by utilizing its judicial discretion and wilfully ignoring all provisions and requirements of consent. This is certainly a strained and unwarranted inference.

There are over threescore provisions in the statute. Many of these have no bearing upon the limited procedure relating to advisory opinions. But, in so far as they are applicable, and in so far as they relate to the requiring of consent of the parties disputant as indispensable to the request of the league for an advisory

opinion, there is no discretion left in the court; the instructions are mandatory and the reasons are plain. After the jurists have said, and the assembly has approved and adopted the proposition, that consent must be required from the interested nations and that a full argument and presentation must be made by both sides before the court will grant an advisory opinion, no possible loophole is left upon which to base an objection or a fear. Is it possible that the court, the jurists and the council are to be in a common conspiracy to deceive and estrange the United States, to "make us a promise to the ear and break it to the hope," when all they get out of it is our immediate withdrawal provided for in the original reservations and in the Root formula? Moreover, it was the court that decided the Eastern Carelia case, and it was feared that the council might in some way upset that decision. We opponents of the court at that time were satisfied with the Eastern Carelia decision, but feared a change through the political power of the council. Now the statute has been amended by action of the council itself, and the instructions given to the court in strict harmony with the Eastern Carelia decision forever require the consent of the disputants as necessary to the giving of an advisory opinion.

The effects of the change in the statute and of the instructions of the reports binding upon the court are the following:

1. The spirit and essence of the Eastern Carelia decision have been adopted and enacted into positive law in the statute of the court.

2. Instead of protecting only the United States from the potential political designs of the council relative to the advisory opinions, this consent requirement now protects every member of the court, and every nation, great or small. In short, the council cannot obtain an advisory opinion from the court on any phase of a dispute touching even the two smallest nations in the world, without the express consent of these two smallest nations in the world.

3. This provision is so broad and promotes such judicial parity among all nations that, together with the express instruction that the court must have both the consent of the disputant nations and full presentation of both sides, the old reservation No. 5 in its entirety and the Root formula are virtually superfluous. For even in the case of the mere claim of interest by the United States, as distinguished from its being a recognized party to a controversy—assuming good faith on the part of the United States, which we all must—it is the simplest thing in the world for us, with a real interest, to write a diplomatic note calling attention to this interest and thereby making ourselves a real party to the dispute. This would then give us the veto under the statute itself because the moment we are a party no advisory opinion can be granted without our express consent. Therefore, the benefits of the Root formula are wholly independent of, and in addition to, these sweeping changes and improvements made by the jurists and the assembly of the league in September. This is not an argument against the Root formula, nor an argument against the old fifth reservation. It is merely saying that the purpose of the Root formula and of the old fifth reservation in their highest sense, and more, have been extended to all members of the court and not to the United States only.

It is only just to add that without the spirit of co-operation and good will created by Mr. Root in his work with the jurists, my own work would not have been possible. The greatness of Mr. Root is again shown by the assistance he has given me and the appreciation and approval he has wholeheartedly accorded my efforts.

4. The consent requirement restricts the power of the league itself to request an advisory opinion largely to questions of administration, or, again to quote from official document A49-1929-V:

"Advisory opinions are given by the court at the request only of the council or the assembly of the league and in general only for the purpose of guiding the organs of the league or the international labor office in questions which come before those bodies in the execution of their duties. They are opinions only, and in theory are not binding."

For as to all advisory opinions in disputes between nations, the league is now the mere channel through which the disputants go to get an advisory opinion from the court when they both want such advisory opinion. Unless they both want it, the league is impotent to get it.

The second point, and one in which I am intensely interested, is that there should be no power of enforcement by war in any form, by the league, of the decisions of the court, as was claimed and at least partially admitted in our senate debate in 1926. The spirit of the peace pact requires the disavowal of force in all aspects of international relations. Now we have its express disavowal as to the court. I quote again from official document A49-1929-V, jurists' report, adopted by the assembly, page 2:

"Misapprehension appears also to exist in the United States as to the powers of the council to give effect to the opinions rendered by the court on questions submitted to it by the council or the assembly. It has, for instance, been suggested that the provisions of the concluding paragraph of article 13 of the covenant would enable the council to oblige the members of the league to resort to war for the purpose of enforcing such an opinion. This view is erroneous. . . . Advisory opinions are given by the court at the request only of the council of the assembly of the league, and in general only for the purpose of guiding the organs of the league or the international labor office in questions which come before those bodies in the execution of their duties. They are opinions only, and in theory they are not binding. Even in cases where an advisory opinion was asked for by the council or the assembly at the request of individual states which preferred to submit their disputes to judicial settlement through the machinery of an advisory opinion rather than by direct submission to the court, the powers of the council would not go beyond its general duty of securing respect for treaty engagements by insuring that parties which submit their dispute for decision by a tribunal shall execute in good faith the decision which may be rendered. The power of the council under article 13, paragraph 4, in connection with awards or judicial decisions, is limited to 'proposing' measures for the purpose of giving effect to them. It cannot do more. It certainly could not oblige States to take measures which would violate their treaty engagements."

The reference in the last sentence to "treaty engagements" is manifestly directed to the peace pact

which provides that nothing but pacific means will be used hereafter in any disputes or conflicts. In fact, one of the original drafts was prepared by M. Fromageot, the French jurist (since elected to membership in the court), after conferences with the writer. He inserted a direct reference to the peace pact on this subject at the time, but the jurists concluded to broaden it by including not only the peace pact but all other pertinent treaty engagements.

In addition, it is the consensus of the jurists and other notables whom I met (and incidentally my own opinion) and that there is, and can be, no sovereign power back of the world court. Here we have a court with no world sovereignty behind it, whose jurisdiction is voluntary and requires consent to any kind of a case between nations, and which has been divorced from all semblance of politics and force. The jurists and the assembly have covered and cured every point of substantial criticism that has ever been leveled against this court as a court. I feel the more confident in this statement by reason of my previous opposition to our adherence to the court, prior to the execution of the peace pact. My opposition was based on the then legality and consequent danger of war, on the claimed power of the league to enforce the decisions of the court by war, and on the potential political connection between the council and the court based upon this unsettled question of advisory opinions. These objections having all been removed, I not only see no objection to our adhering to the court, but I see every necessity for our doing so in the interest of disarmament and world peace.

The peace pact commits us to the use of only "pacific means" in the settlement of controversies and conflicts. The greatest pacific means known to civilization is a judicial body, a court, with judicial functions. How can we, in the presence of our own peace pact, refuse to accept the first judicial body, the greatest pacific means, ever established in international relations? And if we do refuse, how can we ask China or any other nation to submit its dispute to this judicial body whose portals we refuse to enter? Either we are interested in world peace or we are not. Either the United States is to continue its sound leadership for world peace or it is not. The choice is at hand.

S. O. Levinson.

The Butcher Shop of the Holy Spirit

In Latin America, as I heard recently, religion has a peculiar influence on business—peculiar at least to the citizen of the United States. Among other things, this finds expression in the names given to stores, shops, business concerns. I was told that it is not unusual to see signs reading "The Coffee Shop of Jesus Christ," "The Book Shop of the Virgin Mary," "The Butcher Shop of the Holy Spirit." The latter especially caught my imagination. To my Anglo-Saxon background and Quaker faith there seemed something a little incongruous about the *butcher shop* of the Holy Spirit.

My first thought, that the Holy Spirit had descended upon Buenos Aires and established a butcher shop, I put aside as unworthy from every point of view. Nor was my second thought any more worthy. Finally it occurred to me that, after all, here was probably only an ordinary mortal who, wishing to get ahead in his business, perhaps to educate his children and give his wife more of the comforts of life, had adopted a pious phrase in order to appear safe, sound, and upright, in the eyes of those who would have to furnish the money necessary to satisfy his desires. The man was not posing as the Holy Spirit, but was merely borrowing a portion of His raiment that the butcher might shine forth in a way that seemed fitting and proper to potential purchasers. Our good friend was careful, however, not to borrow enough of the raiment to limit in the slightest the deadliness of his stroke, or to arouse disquieting compunctions about the compatibility of his trade with the Spirit, the edge of whose raiment was counted upon to enhance his business, and add to the honor, glory and ease of himself and family.

Having arrived at this conclusion, commonplace enough in Anglo-Saxon Protestant experience, I began to imagine the effect of the sign upon the victims of the trade. Might, perhaps, some sheep on the way to destruction look up and, seeing the legend walk with a lighter step or even a feeling of exultation in the thought that the slaughter was being conducted in the name of, and perhaps in conformity with the will of the Holy Spirit? Or might some other sheep, of clearer vision, go droopingly to his end conscious that to useless slaughter (from his viewpoint, at least) had been added the deceit of pious phrases, hollow mockings of the Divine Will, and the sham of borrowed respectability?

And I thought of the likeness of this to those other sacrifices, not only of animals but of men, women and children, who had been sacrificed in the name of ancient Gods amid the solemn incantations of the priests whose petitions were so loud and carefully sustained as to drown out the pleading of the victims.

But from this darkening picture I awoke with a start to congratulate myself with real Anglo-Saxon lack of understanding, that those days were no more, that the common sense and the spiritual forces of man had long done away with the sacrifice of animals to say nothing about sacrificing man himself. In spite of the sign over the door in Buenos Aires, the butcher shops of the Holy Spirit had long been discontinued, the doors and shutters securely barred and bolted and the key held safely in the hands of a God of love and universal brotherhood.

But here I was brought up with a jerk. Before my eyes tumbled a river of blood in which tossed the mangled bodies of millions of men and mixed with them other millions of forms of women and children, some of whom had been burned to death, some blown to bits by high explosives, some smothered by suffocating gases, while the emaciated bodies of some showed that death came as a welcome relief from starvation, grief, and disease. My senses were benumbed by a terrifying thunder, the rush of airplanes, the rumbling of army trucks, the pop of machine guns, the crack of rifle fire, the roar of artillery, the screech of shells, the boom of exploding bombs. And above it all, rising and falling like the never ending roar of a stormy sea, the screams of agony, the curses of despair of miserable mortals. In the background could

be heard the low, steady, uninterrupted hum of machines working day and night (tended by the wives and daughters of the slaughtered) feverishly turning out more and evermore instruments of death and destruction. (How the devils in hell must have rejoiced!) And the priests? Oh yes, they were there. At their altars, praising God the Father of all mankind, exhorting men everywhere to be strong in the slaughter, glorifying those who were most destructive and adding to the wails of the women, the unheeded sobs of the children, the shouts and curses of the men, the cry in increasing crescendo: "Kill!! In the name of country, kill! In the name of humanity, kill! In the name of God and all that is Holy, kill! *kill, hate; hate, kill; kill, kill!*" (How the devils in hell must have laughed!)

In shame and sorrow I realized that never before even in the darkest days of human sacrifice had there been such a sacrifice as the slaughter of today in the Christian Butcher Shop of the Holy Spirit. And the end is not yet.

RAY NEWTON.

Youth and the World

III.

The Call to Youth Today

If we should strive for a brief exposition of the new and inspiring call that comes to youth today, as the summation of all the better understanding of the universe and of human life as that understanding is possessed by the thinking world of the Twentieth Century, we might use this: "The world, including human life and human possibility, is not a something fixed and static for all time, which we must accept as it is and make the best of; but rather, is like an unfolding flower whose growth, beauty, and fragrance depend on man's own nurture and cultivation of it." That is to say, the final world is by no means yet here; the world is a world in the making—and we are making it.

It is only men of little faith, or men who so greatly mistake their own larger interests as to believe that their narrower selfish interest depends on things remaining forever as they are, who assert that "human nature cannot be changed"—that war will persist forever, that poverty for the many will always continue, that probity in high office is not to be expected, that disease and pain cannot, to any large degree, be ousted from human experience. The fact is that human nature is constantly changing, and in numberless ways, as human conditions change. Look into the records of man's past and see this abundantly; look around anywhere in the present and see it.

And the possibilities for mankind are many which the youth of today might make actualities. At the same time, from what we know of the great need for large world co-operation, if any mighty advance in man's thoughts and deeds is to be brought about, it will be understood that in every one of the possibilities ahead, unlimited stress must be placed on individual endeavor and individual faithfulness—the call coming to every man.

> Fight as if on thee alone
> Hung the issues of the day.

This pre-eminently demands persistence in the well-doing, not transient and merely spasmodic attempts at it. Perhaps the keenest bitterness of manhood is the realization that in the storm and stress of the battle for right into which one entered so bravely and hopefully in youthtime, there came—in some moment of over-weariness, or of harsh emergency, or of physical temptation, or of apparent special danger—the impulse to lag, or even to retreat from the field; or to depend on the action and support of others, rather than, like the king's son in Sill's poem, picking up even a broken sword from the field whence cowards had fled, and with that poor weapon winning the day. In desperate junctures the young unhappily forget the truth which Samuel Butler incidentally points out in his "Way of All Flesh," that "life is most often an affair of being frightened rather than hurt." Men quit too soon.

On the title-page of the first edition of Milton's "Comus," issued in 1637, the poet (who in his youth, it will be recalled, said that if any man would write a great epic he must first make his own life an epic), inscribed in Latin the motto from Vergil:

> Ah! wretched and undone! Myself to have brought
> The wind among my flowers!

Probably there is no cross in manhood so hard to bear as the cross that has been self-made and self-reared—especially when the result is not only the humiliation of the individual concerned, but prodigious loss to a world that might otherwise have been gloriously urged on. History, both political and literary, shows many instances of such loss. In the process of Nature no excuse is ever accepted, nor any natural consequence of delinquent acts remitted because the victim was, in the beginning, mentally superior and spiritually high-purposed, and physically competent, and "meant well." Loss and deterioration through lack of will, or through failure to continue morally upright, are present as disastrously in the prince as in the pauper, in the sage as in the clown. No one can escape. The gods are just, never merciful.

> On crags Caucasian, vultures no more spare
> A bound Prometheus than a blundering hare.

Nor must any heroic young soul, who in youthful ardor dedicates his life to the great cause of man,—any youth who, like Eugéne de Guérin, feels the pain in a brother's side and would mitigate it,—expect necessarily the reward of public appreciation, much less any material reward. In Thayer's "Life and Letters of John Hay" it is written, in connection with Hay's early longing to give himself to the high calling of poesy without thought of the material consequences: "Although Illinois was pouring millions into the lap of many a business man and 'railroad magnate,' it would not then have furnished a daily mess of pottage to either a Milton or a Byron." Would Hay's adopted State of Illinois, or any other State or land, furnish more now, after seventy years?

But the material reward is the last thing held in mind by ardent young Washingtons and Lafayettes and

Pasteurs and Steinmetzes and Robert Gould Shaws. And fortunately the youth of today—thousands of them—are beginning to realize at least a little of the good sense of John Burroughs, that the simple and good life is far above excessive and largely useless and often morally harmful "possessions." Towards the close of his remarkable career, Andrew Carnegie announced what he called the "greatest discovery" of his life, namely (in his own words), that "the men who do the world's work never get rich"—never get the world's "money." But Burroughs said wisely, as the result of his Franklin-like observation during eighty years,

> There can be little doubt, I think, that intercourse with Nature and knowledge of her ways tends to simplicity of life. We come more and more to see through the follies and vanities of the world and to appreciate real values. As I grow older (he said), I am more and more inclined to reduce my baggage, to lop off superfluities. The show and splendor of great houses, elaborate furnishings, stately halls, oppress me. They fix the attention upon false standards of beauty; they stand between me and real feeders of character and thought.

There will be no real hindrance for light-hearted and eager-willed youth, in the dedication of themselves to great causes, when they understand that the "poverty" which their friends fear for them means only simple and healthful living, more fresh air, appreciation of real beauty, the spirit's exaltation, and longer life!

And how much more to be desired than gold, yea, than much fine gold, is the world's respect and honor, if haply and happily these should come! At the same time, even honors are a minor reward, and may be dispensed with if in their absence there is the consciousness of having greatly deserved them! Robert Gould Shaw has been named. William James in his "Memories and Studies" pays affectionate tribute to him. In a time of National "falsehood and horrible contradiction," says James, Shaw was among those who stood for freedom and truth. "Truth! even though for the moment it must be truth written in hell fire." And James says further,

> What country under heaven has not thousands of such youths to rejoice in, youths on whom the safety of the human race depends? Whether or not they leave memorials behind them, whether their names are writ in water or in marble depends mostly on the opportunities which the accidents of history throw into their path.

And the best saying of all by James in this particular connection is where he prophetically adds: "That lonely kind of courage"—moral service for world-progress and for man, rather than simple "fortitude" in war—"is the kind of valor to which the monuments of nations should most of all be reared."

At the same time, ardent youth toiling for their fellows can do without the reward even of monuments if they realize that greater than all honors is honor, and that greater than any material reward is the consciousness of having helped. JAMES H. WEST.

The Study Table

What Is Religion?

Every book worth reviewing is a signal of progress in some direction. The reader wants to know the direction and stage of progress so far, and then wants to be shown where we go from here.

This book by Professor Sellars* beacons progress. Few volumes of the period will so potently inspire and direct the thinking of those who care about religion. Rather put the statement this way, Few volumes indicate so clearly the stage and direction of constructive religious thinking of the day. It is easy to be laudatory. The main business of the reviewer, however is to be critical.

Professor Sellars is a philosopher. He has most of the excellencies and some of the limitations of the guild. Indeed the book shows that he is a guild man. This of itself is a defect in a philosopher. The philosopher above all others should rise above provincialism and be free of the pride of cult. Yet this book might with some aptness be entitled, "Salvation by Philosophy." The actual title employed, "Religion Coming of Age," reveals an aberration in the author's thinking which points to another defect. Religion is not the sort of thing which "comes of age." Humanity is too old for that, and religion is too vitally identified with the tortuous movements of the human current. *A* religion may "come of age" but *religion* is warped and confused in the fundmental conception by such a phrase.

Professor Sellars is more philosopher than historian. He, indeed, accepts conventional historical interpretations of religion with too ready an enthusiasm to vindicate his complete competence as a philosopher. It is a question whether the outstanding need of religion today is not an overhauling of accepted interpretations of its historical development. Some if not all of the ethnic religious systems still extant have sprung from disordered, diseased religious natures, or else have been profoundly affected by such natures in the course of their development. It is not impossible that a new scrutiny of the whole range of religion in the course of human development will show that what are now esteemed to be the essentials of religion are merely incidentals, perhaps most of them adventitious. Professor Sellars' book makes no contribution to this needed service.

The last chapter of the book is its weakest. This is a common fault of such works. Perhaps it is so general and inevitable a mark of them as not properly to be styled a fault. How strikingly is the statement true of William James's classic "Varieties of Religious Experience!"

This closing chapter of Professor Sellars' book throws together in a sort of sketched program for the future a number of incongruities. Professor Sellars pointedly and effectively states that

> the technique of the new stage of religion will be worked out gradually as the past was. We may be sure that the permanent demands of human nature will find expression in it. And we must not take it for granted that we shall always have the same institutions as were built up around the old cosmic perspective. Institutions are built up around functions, and these express needs and beliefs. As these change, we must expect institutions to alter, though they will do it reluctantly and slowly.

This statement is not thoroughly vindicated in the

*"Religion Coming of Age," by Roy Wood Sellars, The MacMillan Company.

rest of the discussion in the chapter. Professor Sellars seems to recognize as essentials of religion elements in the individual and purely personal expression of the aesthetic nature which must prove incongruous, we dare say, with conceptions of religion which become clear as its true genius is recognized. When Professor Sellars remarks "I myself find music, poetry and a quiet walk into the country effective for that gathering together of oneself that is good for one at times" he is describing a personal reaction to a very definite human demand, but he is offering no interpretation which is significant for the construction of the religious program of the future. Religion, if its long sweep in history is significant, must be interpreted in social terms. It is by definition a social bond and our current ethnic religions which exhaust themselves in or devote their major energies to the cultivation of a mystical pietism have simply missed the point. That is not religion, nor is it an essential feature of a religious program.

Professor Sellars finds an abiding place for the churches in American society, yet his "naturalism" robs them of all of the doctrines which the sponsors for the churches declare to be essential to their existence and to the perpetuity of the Christianity of which they are the protagonists and apologists. Professor Sellars' theses rob them of deity, of personal immortality, and, of course, of the doctrine of a sinner in the hands of a grieved or affronted God.

Furthermore, Professor Sellars makes no recognition of the incongruity of the ecclesiastical system in that democratic order to which our essential institutions are committed. Conceiving the churches either as exponents of denominational systems or as any other element "called out"—an *ecclesia*—this fundamental incongruity persists. It will be a strenuous task for the philosophical guild, which Professor Sellars invokes as the interpreters of the new salvation, to find a continuing place for this ecclesiastical system in the promulgation of the religious technique and program of the future.

The stage, therefore, which has been reached by Professor Sellars' book is little advanced beyond the general break-up of the old order. The new order has not clearly dawned even upon his vision. The break-up which his book signalizes is profound. He has rendered a great service to the cause of religion in pointing out that religion survives and thrives and gains its largest headway without the aid of the doctrines already mentioned, doctrines which he disregards or sets aside but which our ecclesiastical leaders are unanimous in pronouncing to be the irreducible minimum beyond which concessions to liberalism cannot be permitted. It will be hard for Professor Sellars to convince the ecclesiastical mind that anything is left of religion after he has finished with it. His keen analyses, however, will greatly hearten those who believe that religion is bigger and better and essentially different from that which is today embodied in ecclesiastical groups and programs.

The technique which Professor Sellars rightly declares must be the concern of the future will be wrought out more readily because of this ground-clearing process. It must appear to the practical-minded, however, that the technicians who will render this service will not gain their chief distinction from high-priesthood in the philosophical hierarchy.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Modern Catholicism

Here* is a volume to charm the most fastidious book-lover. Written in that rare and charming style that characterized the author's "Jesuit Enigma," it goes right to the heart of the problem of modern Catholicism. No trace of bitterness mars its pages. Yet its analysis of this age-old ecclesiastical system of the Middle Ages is searching because of the sound psychological background from which Doctor Barrett speaks. And his humor! One could wish the luck to have been born an Irishman when the rich humor of the Emerald Isle laughs at him from almost every page.

Some of the chapter titles alone are enough to make the most sophisticated bookman want to own and read. "Reliable Catholics," "Eccentric Catholics," "Hell's Waning Prestige," as significant for Protestants as for Catholics, "Should Priests Marry?" "God's Forgotten Biography," "Is the Catholic Church Democratic?" "Dream-wishes of Reform," and "The Subconscious-Anathema Sit!" These are only samples of Doctor Barrett's ability to put his finger tellingly on those spots in the Catholic Church in which intelligent Catholics and Protestants are alike interested.

Of course, it was to be expected that Doctor Barrett's book would bring forth a deluge of criticism, bordering occasionally on abuse, from those savants of the Catholic Church that seem more interested in maintaining the venerable status quo of their century laden ecclesiastical system than they do in seeking and finding truth. Yet it is difficult to see how Doctor Barrett, himself a truth-seeking Catholic, could have been more fair and at the same time actually have told the truth about the good that Catholicism achieves on the one hand, and the psychological harm that it inflicts, especially upon the young, on the other hand.

As one reads it becomes more and more evident that Doctor Barrett is seeking to help the Catholic Church become the agent of great good, even as it was in its inception ages ago, before enigmas began to multiply "like barnacles on the bark of Peter." He sees all too clearly that in order to become again an agent for the return of primitive Christianity, it must be purged of much of its impossible dogmas and "pious practices" that have grown up through the ages. As a true and loyal Catholic, loving the Church, which has nurtured him, he holds great hope for it, *if* those powers that be will only prove wise enough to follow his suggestions, especially the one with which the volume closes, in which he suggests a way out for the magisterium of Rome. Simply promulgate one final infallible dogma to the effect "that as the Church grows, in body and mind, she must be forever busy reclothing her body and mind, the former in newer, whiter garments, the latter in truer, simpler language, that she must step by step rid herself of worn-out customs, doctrines, and dogmas." Certainly there would be hope for the old Mother Church of Christendom, if her sons will but heed the voice of this prophet in her midst.

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.

Can We Help It?

A personal acquaintanceship with an intense admiration for the personality of Dr. Hall Quest would bias your reviewer in favor of his book, "It's Not Our Fault,"† but despite these predilections it is hard to give

*"While Peter Sleeps," by E. Boyd Barrett. Ives Washburn, Inc., N. Y.

†"It's Not Our Fault"—"Why We Can't Be Good," by Alfred Lawrence Hall Quest. Published by Horace Liveright. $2.50.

it unqualified praise. It is still another attempt to balance the influences of heredity and environment. That society and not the individual is to blame for the ills of society, but that individuals constitute society and hence are to blame finally, is the thesis.

Maybe so! "Middletown" would justify this thesis. Whence shall come the cure? Dr. Hall Quest says from education. Your reviewer would agree, but his own experience in his humble efforts to present this thesis to school folks would not suggest that Dr. Hall Quest's millenium is very near at hand.

That there is nothing new under the sun in the category of wrong doing is a comforting philosophy which should be conned and learned by rote by censors in Boston and elsewhere!

Perhaps the least convincing treatment in the book is that given to religion. The abandonment of moral control according to inherited religion can only be achieved when Dr. Hall Quest's educational process has provided an alternative. To abandon it in the *status quo* would be to substitute chaos.

One is intrigued to find that Dr. Hall Quest's final dictum is the application of the Golden Rule. Assuredly, but how? Ask Dr. Hoover.

EMANUEL STERNHEIM.

Note

John Haynes Holmes's new book, "Palestine Today and To-morrow," is considered so important in England, because of the clear-sighted way in which it deals with a controversial subject, that the firm of George Allen and Unwin is bringing out an independent edition for the British public. The book is published in this country by Macmillan. ($2.50.)

Correspondence

Cruelties in Hungary

Editor of UNITY:

Prominent Americans are sending letters of protest to the Hungarian minister at Washington against the cruelties inflicted in the prisons of Hungary upon political offenders.

These now number many hundreds, and they have all gone on hunger strike. At last accounts, four had died from forcible feeding while in straitjackets, and after severe floggings. The prisoners include many persons not convicted who are only held for examination.

The prison conditions are so bad that many have contracted tuberculosis, yet even these are required to do eleven hours of hard labor daily on wretched food. The hunger strikers demand improved conditions and relief from floggings. All are in prison for opposing the present dictatorship.

Letters of protest should be written to the Hungarian minister, Count Laszlo Szechenyi, Hungarian Embassy, Washington, D. C.

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

Dorchester, Mass.

College Football

Editor of UNITY:

Your editorial about the hopelessness of trying to make headway against the abuses of college football comes before me just at a time when I have been hearing some significant evidence which points toward the undermining of the institution at its very foundation.

In a chat with a college dean, he tells me that the reaction against football "ballyhoo" is well under way among the students of most colleges and universities. "The student deeply resents the idea that it is his duty to buy tickets, to attend rallies, to take part in mass cheering. Many of them, of course, still do it through inherent sporting instinct, or because the crowd is doing it. The revolt is against football as a test of loyalty and a considerable minority at many colleges are making a virtue of ignoring or ridiculing the whole football business."

This man goes further and expresses the opinion that football does not appeal to the post-war student psychology, as it did to the psychology of twenty years ago. For better or worse, prominence in rough sports is less and less a criterion of college greatness. The student no longer thinks of himself as a potential player, unless he is one of the selected few who have been watched and publicized from the grammar school upward.

The demand for victory is so acute and has such a high money value that only the specialist has a chance. Professionalism consists less in the hiring or subsidizing of players than in offering them lucrative careers in the football realm. Many if not most of them are taking physical education courses to qualify themselves for well paid coaching positions or to enter journalism via the sport page.

It is entirely probable, this man thinks, that football is at its zenith today. He does not think that the publicity, the profits, the alumni ego which sustain it will carry it far in the absence of the old-time undergraduate zeal. And this, he is sure, is fading rapidly. Student indifference is tacitly encouraged by many faculty members who deeply resent the prominence of the football staff in the affairs of the college and the comparative salaries paid to coaches and to professors or even presidents. Hoping my friend knows his stuff, I am,

H. P. BOYNTON.

Cleveland, Ohio.

A "Birth Control" Meeting

Editor of UNITY: The writer saw an advertisement of a "birth control" symposium and decided to attend. It being a warm night few came, mostly "regulars." The writer was asked to act as chairman and accepted. The first speaker declared "birth control" was a private affair. It ought to be taught to save women from the annoyance of having children. But the feeling it was "naughty" to touch on the question keeps the poverty-stricken, who need to know, from accepting advice. The Catholic Church also considers the teaching and practice a sin, hence the refusal of adherents to open their minds to such teachings.

The second speaker introduced himself as a man of the street. He believed all children were accidents. Sex was a greater need than "pork chops," and every human being is but following his normal instincts to indulge in sex. All "young people," married or unmarried, ought to be educated in "birth control." Children are a by-product. The economic system prevents the "submerged tenth" from bringing up their children properly, so why have them?

A woman, a mother, said she had two children. She was separated from her husband. This woman felt that children do not care for parents or grandparents. Parents, she said, get nothing but worry in raising children—very little, if any, joy. There is one angle to the question, she said, that had not been touched. Unless the teaching was universal, the brown, black and yellow races, with fecundity unchecked, would conquer the white race by their overwhelming numbers.

The next speaker, a man, said, "You are talking about the need of 'birth control' but do not tell where to get the information free from bias or misinformation or injury." So he gave the address of the office of the Birth Control League in Chicago.

A young man refuted the notion that young people need to know about "birth control." He had just graduated from a "prep" school—a boarding school where the young students, he said, had full information about all the various contraceptives.

The writer of this article gave his views. The economic

The Field

"The world is my country,
to do good is my Religion."

THE DIVINE PLAN

"Read, learn and inwardly digest"

It is the nature of man to congregate in communities, and as the hamlet expands into the town and city, community government develops. This causes desirable locations or sites to grow in value. Just as it was part of the divine plan that food should grow to sustain life so it would seem a part of the plan that site-values should grow to provide funds to sustain community government.

And it has done so. But man-made laws inherited by us from an age that is past and gone are frustrating this plan.

The selling price of land is mainly a location, or site value. (It is the annual rental-values capitalized). This value is created by the community and should be collected for the public treasury to meet the expenses of government, but our laws permit it to be privately appropriated. Hence we have the holding of land by those who make no use of it except to exact tribute from those who need land for homes and business.

These laws are the basic cause of poor housing, and the main cause of that poverty which comes from the inability of men who want jobs to find proper employment, because labor and capital are so shut out from the use of land by excessive prices. The number of suicides and crimes because of inability to get employment is far greater than is realized.

These laws also promote perjury by encouraging people to make oath or assent to false tax statements, and they are the cause of a large part of the crime in all classes of society.

So long as our churches and churchmen refrain from protesting against our existing tax laws they deny the laws of Moses and the precepts of Jesus.

You may favor these tax laws because your attention has not been called to the evils they generate, but if you will think about them you will realize the immoral and criminal effect of them.

Collecting the rental value of land for community purposes through increasing the tax on site-value would break up absentee land-holding and the holding of land to exact an increased price from the children of the rising generation and the necessities of your fellow-men.

An increased tax on site-value will reduce taxes on industry, farms and homes, reduce involuntary poverty, replace congested and diseased housing with modern housing, and help all of us realize nobler human sentiments.

The spirit of it is the Brotherhood of Man.

The impelling motive is the Sermon on the Mount which prompts the humanitarian desire to eradicate the injustice which compels the mass of civilized human beings to pay a part of the proceeds of their labor to others, purchase price or rent, for the right to live and work on land—that free gift of God to all the children of men in all generations, and that element which every human being must use that he may live.

Thy Kingdom, Come on Earth, for which we pray on bended knees will not come—can not come—while man-made laws promote dishonesty, and wrongfully enable the few to exact tribute of the many for the use of God's free bounty to all mankind.

ALFRED N. CHANDLER.

Roseville, Newark, New Jersey.

THE CHURCH AND LABOR

[A message to the churches from the Secretary for Church and Labor of the Presbyterian Board of National Missions.]

The labor question is a question of providing for every worker an abundant life, a full and complete expression of personality.

Money means home, school, hospitality, travel and recreation.

Properly regulated work humanizes.

To create a personality one must have leisure.

Abuses affect the morale of the worker adversely and in a manner which possesses portentous social consequences.

Problems of industry are problems of democracy, of human conduct.

It is the duty of every Christian to insist that the ultimate criterion of every social institution, economic activity and industrial organization be found in the teachings of Jesus Christ.

A Christian community must be held morally responsible for the character of its economic and industrial order.

The future peace of industry lies in mutual knowledge and confidence.

No economic convenience ever justifies human oppression.

The welfare of human beings must be the first condition of any industry carried on by Christian men.

The authentic all-important human product is character, good taste, domestic affection, social capacity and other laudable attributes which combine to make the man greater than the tool.

It is pre-eminently the task of the Church to raise up a breed of men determined never to prosper at the expense of their neighbors and bent on finding their highest pleasure in helping their fellowmen.

WHAT PROHIBITION PREVENTS

While the general net effect of national prohibition continues a matter for anxious debate, the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children comes forward with its apparent results in a state generally regarded as "wet" and in a type of social work which deals with "the very worst types of family problems." In the last pre-war year, 1916, intemperance so serious as to figure as a cause of child abuse accounted for 47.7 per cent of the factors in cases handled by the society. In 1921, under post-

---

phases had been touched on. He felt nothing in this world compares with the happiness of seeing a child grow. The writer was very poor. He had to go to work at the age of eleven, and has worked continuously since. Never smoked, chewed, or drank liquor or abused his body otherwise. Having taken physical culture, baths and simple diet since he was sixteen (now sixty-nine years old) he felt he could indulge in a little advice.

Let people receive "birth control" information, but do not teach that happiness is found in promiscuous relations. The writer had dreams he could not indulge. He was able to carry out the dreams in his daughter who was given a thorough education in music and had made good. The happiness of the accomplishment of his dream meant more than any sexual indulgence. The cost of raising properly a child or children has advanced. But many of the pleasures now so prevalent, movies, cosmetics, radio, autos, etc., cost more than the rearing of a child. The striving to keep up appearances for a sensible married couple must give way to a greater happiness in having children who, if intelligently taught, will return joys manifoldly greater than the flashing pleasures of today.

The writer, observing the general tone of the meeting, was impressed by its sordidness. Nothing but sex indulgence it was believed would bring happiness. Philosophy, the auto, the sciences, all the pleasures we are taught give permanent satisfactions, were as nothing in the opinion of erotomaniacs as against the pleasure of sex. This stressing of the one element in our bodily constitution is an alarming phase of current literature, the stage, and the movies. Why not without cant, or pious warnings, teach the rising generations the truth in economics and other interests of life? This was the impression left with the writer of this true story.

Chicago, Illinois. M. L.

An Explanation

Editor of UNITY:

In order to avoid any misunderstanding that might arise from my address' being given at the end of my article in this week's UNITY as the General Theological Seminary, New York City, may I say that though this is my address, I am not a student here but merely on the staff of the library. If you will be kind enough to publish this letter, it may help to avoid some confusion.

T. RICHARD WITMER.

The General Theological Seminary,
New York City.

A Good Friend!

Editor of UNITY:

Professor Fadner and I get a lot of satisfaction from the weekly religious thriller which comes to us from 700 Oakwood Boulevard. We thank you! Unitedly.

HERBERT STURGES.

Lombard College.

A Timely New Book

PALESTINE

TODAY AND TOMORROW

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Dr. Stephen S. Wise says: "It is the most understanding book that has been written about Palestine." It is also a most revealing book, based on a recent journey through Palestine and written largely since the recent riots between Jews and Arabs. The Zionist movement in all its aspects is graphically surveyed. You will finish this unusual exposition with a new understanding of Palestine and its problems.

Just Published by THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Price $2.50

Order from UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

JANUARY

Preparations for a trip south, or a continuation of Winter Social Activities at home, suggest that you save expense thru the cleansing of your garments by our new system of continuous clarification.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

war prohibition, that percentage became 16.8. The high-point in this period was 1923, when the percentage of intemperance among the "factors and elements in neglect of children," as measured against the society's yearly average of 5,000 families from all parts of the state, had risen to 23.2. In 1928, according to the recent report for that year, it had fallen again to 20.8 per cent. "At all times since national prohibition," the report comments, "intemperance, as it affects our work, has been reduced to less than half what it was before. Whatever else may be said, national prohibition, poorly enforced as it may be in Massachusetts, has by so much reduced child abuse and neglect caused by intemperance as seen in our work, and, by the same token, has contributed greatly to the peace, comfort, and happiness of mothers and children."—The *Survey Graphic.*

AN INDISPENSABLE BOOK ON INDIA

Strongly endorsed by Tagore, Gandhi, Lajpat Rai, Mrs. Besant, Presidents of the Indian National Congress, Indian Leaders of All Parties, practically the Whole Periodical Press of India.

INDIA IN BONDAGE

Her Right to Freedom and a Place Among the Great Nations
By JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND, M. A., D. D.

Pp. 556. 12 Illustrations. Price at Booksellers $4.00, by mail $4.10.
Lewis Copeland Co., Inc.
Publishers, 119 West 57th St.
New York, N. Y.

This book, just from the press in New York, was published a few months ago in India. The British Government, alarmed at its quick and great sale, suppressed it, and arrested its publishers. Practically all India answered by indignant protests. Mahatma Gandhi published an article in the book's defense, four columns in length.

No other word in our generation has been so universally acclaimed by the highest Indian authorities, as a true and just portrayal of India's civilization, life, and political conditions.

RABINDRANATH TAGORE the poet writes: "If Americans would know the true India, they cannot have a better guide than Dr. Sunderland. I regard his book as the best informed, most just and trustworthy that has come from any pen. A part of its high value is as an unanswerable reply to the misrepresentations in Miss Mayo's **Mother India.**"

MRS. ANNA BESANT writes: "Dr. Sunderland's powerful chapters should be read by everybody who would understand India."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES says: "No other American is so widely known or so loved in India, as Dr. Sunderland, and this book gives eloquent testimony as to the reasons why."

THE PATRIKA, Calcutta's leading daily declares: **"India in Bondage** easily takes the first place among all the books on India in recent years."